

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1-39 have been rejected. No claim amendments are filed herein. Applicants respectfully request re-Examination and reconsideration of the pending claims. It is believed that pending claims 1-39 are now  
5 each in allowable form.

**I. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 20 and 29 in View of the Saito Reference**

In paragraphs 3-11 of the subject Office Action, claims 1-3, 10-13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (U.S. Publication  
10 2002/0113924), hereinafter "Saito". In paragraphs 13-21 of the Office Action, claims 20-22, 29-32 and 37 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito. In paragraph 23 of the Office Action, claim 39 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito. Applicants respectfully submit that these claim rejections are overcome based on reasons set forth below.

15 Unamended claims 1, 20 and 39 are the independent claims of the aforementioned rejected claims.

Each of independent claims 1 and 20 recites the feature of:

20 a first member having a body and a groove formed in the body for holding [a<sup>1</sup>/the<sup>20</sup>] lamp, the first member attaching the lamp to [a<sup>1</sup>/the<sup>20</sup>] lamp housing.

Independent claim 39 recites the feature of:

a groove extending through the body . . . , the groove for holding the lamp, and the body attaching the lamp to the lamp housing.

Clearly, in each of independent claims 1, 20 and 39, a "body" attaches the lamp  
25 to the lamp housing, the groove extends through this body, and the groove retains the lamp. Applicants respectfully submit that, given the definition of a groove as a long

narrow furrow or channel (Webster's II Collegiate Dictionary, 1995) and the definition of hold as "to have or maintain in the grasp" (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary - <http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=hold>), the only plausible interpretation of the claim language is that the lamp rests in the groove, i.e., is supported by the surfaces defining the groove. This as described in the specification and shown in the drawings. Each of claims 1, 20 and 39, and the claims that depend from claims 1 and 20, are distinguished from the Saito reference on account of the following.

In the rejections of each of claims 1, 20 and 39, the Examiner equates the reflection plate REF in Figure 6 of Saito, to the claimed "body" through which the groove extends and which attaches the lamp to the lamp housing. Applicants respectfully point out that the reflection plate REF in Figure 6 of Saito does not attach the lamp – CFL, to the lamp housing. This is not taught or suggested anywhere in Saito. From an examination of the figures associated with the embodiment shown in Figure 6 of Saito (Figures 6-8 covering the seventh embodiment), it is clear that the lamps CFL do not even contact the reflection plate REF and that the lamps CFL are attached to the lamp housing directly or by other means. Since this member alleged to be the "body" by the Examiner does not attach the lamp to the lamp housing, this reflection plate member REF does not satisfy the claimed "body" structure as in independent claims 1, 20 and 39 which are therefore distinguished from Saito. Applicants also point out since REF is a reflector plate formed of a reflective material and the disclosure does not recite the structural relation between the reflector plate and lamp, one certainly would not assume

that the REF plate would be used to physically connect the lamps to the lamp housing, nor would it be obvious.

Furthermore, each of claims 1, 20 and 39 recite the feature that the groove holds the lamp. In other words the lamp rests in the groove or is supported by surfaces that define the groove. In Saito, again, the reflection plate REF compared by the Examiner to the claimed "body", also does not contact the lamp, much less have the lamp supported by contact with the groove formed within the body. If the Examiner contends that the valley section of the reflector plate REF is a groove it should be pointed out that this groove does not contact and therefore cannot "hold" the lamp as in the claimed invention. Figure 6 clearly shows the lamps CFL are substantially spaced from REF. Applicants also point out that this plate REF is a reflector plate formed of a reflective material and since the disclosure does not recite the structural relation between the reflector plate and lamp, one certainly would not assume that the lamps would be held by contact with the reflection plate REF.

Independent claims 1, 20 and 39 are therefore distinguished from the reference of Saito. Claims 2, 3, 10-13 and 18 are therefore also distinguished from the reference of Saito by reason of their dependency from claim 1. Similarly, claims 21, 22, 29-32 and 37 are distinguished from Saito by reason of their dependency from claim 20.

Claim 39 also recites the feature that the body containing the groove that holds the lamp and attaches the lamp to the housing, also supports the diffuser plate:

"a body with an elongated portion that supports the diffuser plate and prevents the diffuser plate from distorting, a groove extending through the body and disposed beneath the elongated portion, the groove for holding the lamp, and the body attaching the lamp to the lamp housing".

As such, claim 39 is further distinguished from Saito because the reflector plate REF of Saito that the Examiner alleges to be the body containing the groove, does not have an elongated portion that supports the diffuser plate as alleged by the Examiner. Rather, spacer HLD supports the diffuser plate. Spacer HLD is clearly distinguished from reflection plate REF: "wherein a distal end of spacer HLD penetrates a crest portion of the mountain of the reflection plate REF" (Saito, Paragraph 0100). Clearly, reflection plate REF and spacer HLD are two separate components and could not be considered "a body" as described in claim 39.

The rejection of claims 1-3, 10-13, 18, 20-22, 29-32, 37 and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito, should therefore be withdrawn.

## **II. Rejection of Claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraph 24 of the Office Action, claims 4-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito as applied to claim 1 and further in view of Lee (U.S. Publication 2002/0044437). Applicants submit that these claim rejections are overcome based on the reasons set forth below.

The cited reference of Lee has apparently been relied upon for teaching a second member that includes a groove. Lee, however, does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies of Saito and therefore claims 4-9, which depend from claim 1, are distinguished from the references of Saito and Lee, taken alone or in combination. Therefore the paragraph 24 rejection of claims 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), should be withdrawn.

**III. Rejection of Claims 14-17, 23-28 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

In paragraphs 31-45 of the subject Office Action, claims 14-17, 23-28 and 33-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of either the Examiner's comments and observations, the reference of Marsh (U.S. Patent 6,471,388), the reference of Tsai (U.S. Patent 6,722,733), or the reference of Lee (U.S. Publication 2002/0044437). Applicants respectfully submit that each of these claim rejections is overcome for reasons set forth below.

The cited reference of Marsh is not directed to liquid crystal display backlight assemblies as in the claimed invention, but, rather is directed to display signs such as "EXIT" signs displayed in buildings. Marsh is therefore non-analogous art and one in possession of the Saito reference, would not look to a disclosure on building exit signs to modify the Saito teaching. Marsh has apparently been relied upon for disclosing a locking member including a locking shoulder that extends through an aperture for holding two members together. Marsh, however, does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies of Saito.

Tsai has apparently been relied upon for teaching a ring-shape member disposed about a section of the lamp for providing cushioning for the lamp. Tsai therefore does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies of Saito.

The cited reference of Lee has apparently been relied upon for providing a support for a backlight unit including a second member having an elongated body for supporting a diffuser plate of the backlight assembly when it attempts to sag or distort, wherein the body has a groove, and apparently also for providing that the support includes a second member/contact portion having elasticity and preferably made of a

soft material. The reference of Lee therefore does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies of Saito.

Additionally, in reference to the rejection of claims 35 and 36 in paragraph 46 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that it would have been obvious to one having  
5 ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the groove into a relatively semi-circular shape. Applicants respectfully submit that such modification also does not make up for the above-stated deficiencies of Saito.

Since none of the references nor the Examiner's allegation of an obvious modification, make up for the above-stated deficiencies of the primary reference of  
10 Saito, and since claims 1, 20 and 39 are distinguished from Saito, the rejection of dependent claims 14-17, 23-28 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), should be withdrawn.

**IV. Rejection of Claims 19 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

15 In paragraph 12 of the Office Action, claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsai et al (U.S. Patent 6,722,733), hereinafter "Tsai". In paragraph 22 of the Office Action, claim 38 was also rejected under this section as being anticipated by Tsai. In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner also commented that, with respect to independent claims 19 and 38, the prior art of Tsai  
20 considered by the Examiner to meet the scope of the claim. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 19 and 38 as being anticipated by Tsai, should be withdrawn for reasons set forth below and that Tsai is distinguished from the claimed invention and does not meet the scope of the pending claims.

Claim 19 recites the feature of: "a body with a groove extending through the body for holding a lamp of the backlight assembly"; and independent claim 38 recites the feature of "a first member having a body in a groove extending through the body for holding the lamp, the first member attaching the lamp to the lamp housing". Each of independent claims 19 and 38 therefore recite a groove extending through the body and also recite the feature that the groove is for holding the lamp, i.e. allowing the lamp to be supported in the groove by contacting the groove surfaces. Applicants respectfully submit that this is the only plausible interpretation of the claim language given the definition of a groove as a long narrow channel or depression as discussed above.

Applicants respectfully submit that Tsai does not show a groove in Figure 5B. In particular, void area 220b may be considered a slice or other aperture between hooked portions 220a but is not a groove, i.e. it is NOT a "long narrow furrow or channel". In the specification (col. 3, l 64) opening 220b is aptly referred to as gap 220b, and is neither a furrow or a channel.. Moreover, gap 220b is clearly not configured "for holding a lamp" as in the claimed invention. Clearly, hooked portions 220a hold the lamp: "the hooked portions 220a of the supporting device 220 are configured to support the lamp 210" Independent claims 19 and 38 are therefore distinguished from the reference of Tsai and the rejection of claims 19 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsai, should be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the foregoing, each of claims 1-39 is in allowable form and the application therefore in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully and expeditiously requested.

5

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 31 May 2005



Mark J. Marcelli, Reg. No. 36,593  
Attorney for Applicants

10

DUANE MORRIS LLP  
101 West Broadway, Suite 900  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: (619) 744-2200  
Facsimile: (619) 744-2201

15